

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SCOPING AND INFORMATIONAL MEETING
NEWFOLDEN - AUGUST 11, 2015 - 6:00 P.M.
BEFORE THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
AND DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

In the Matter of the Application of Enbridge Energy,
Limited Partnership for a Certificate of Need and a
Pipeline Routing Permit for the Line 3 Replacement
Project in Minnesota from the North Dakota Border to the
Wisconsin Border

MPUC DOCKET NOs. PL-9/CN-14-916
PL-9/PPL-15-137

Newfolden Community Center
145 East 1st Street
Newfolden, Minnesota

August 11, 2015

1	I N D E X - NEWFOLDEN - 6:00 P.M.	
2	SPEAKER	PAGE
3	Tracy Smetana	3
4	Mitch Repka	10
5	John McKay	17
6	John Glanzer	17
7	Barry Simonson	17
8	Arshia Javaherian	18
9	Paul Turner	18
10	John Pechin	18
11	Jamie Macalister	18
12	Robert Teran	24
13	Tom Pahkala	25
14	Scott Erlander	26
15	David Barnett	28
16	Patrick Johnson	29
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 MS. TRACY SMETANA: Good evening,
2 everyone. We're going to go ahead and get started.

3 My name is Tracy Smetana, I'm the public
4 advisor with the Minnesota Public Utilities
5 Commission, and we are here for a public information
6 meeting for the Enbridge Line 3 Replacement Project.

7 In this particular project there are two
8 docket numbers at the Commission. So it's two
9 different permits that the company needs before they
10 can build this. The first is what we call a
11 certificate of need, and it answers the question is
12 the project needed. The second is what we call a
13 route permit, and as you might guess by the title,
14 it determines where it would go.

15 So the purpose of tonight's meeting is to
16 explain the Public Utilities Commission's review
17 process, to provide some basic information about the
18 proposed project, to gather information for the
19 environmental review, and to answer general
20 questions about the process and the project.

21 For those of you that have looked at the
22 notice, you have seen this agenda before. I do want
23 to point out that at 7:30 there will be a break. So
24 just to keep that in mind.

25 So who is the Public Utilities

1 Commission? We're a state agency, we have five
2 commissioners that are appointed by the governor and
3 about 50 staff and we regulate a number of utility
4 related issues including permitting for pipelines,
5 which is, of course, why we're here this evening.

6 Again, the company needs to have a
7 certificate of need from the Public Utilities
8 Commission before it can build anything. Here is
9 the statutes and rules that apply to that process if
10 you're looking for some good bedtime reading.
11 Again, the same information for the route permit,
12 the statutes and rules that apply here as well.

13 Now, through the Commission's process
14 there are a number of folks that get involved. The
15 first is the applicant, that's what we call the
16 company asking for the project. So in this case
17 that's Enbridge Energy.

18 We also have two divisions within the
19 Department of Commerce that are involved in the
20 process. The first is the Energy Environmental
21 Review and Analysis group, sometimes abbreviated
22 EERA. And as you might guess by their name, they
23 conduct the environmental review.

24 The Energy Regulation and Planning
25 division at the Department of Commerce, again,

1 Commerce is a state agency, their job is to
2 represent the public interest and pretty much
3 anything that comes before the Commission. And in
4 this particular case they participate in the
5 certificate of need process, but not the route.

6 We also have another state agency, the
7 Office of Administrative Hearings. Later on in the
8 process we'll have an administrative law judge from
9 that department that comes out to hold hearings,
10 gather evidence, and write a report for the Public
11 Utilities Commission. Again, they're a separate
12 state agency, they're not connected to the
13 Commission, they're not connected to Commerce.

14 At the Commission, or the PUC, as we have
15 it abbreviated here, there are two different folks
16 you might work with. The first is our energy
17 facilities planner. You can sort of think of that
18 person as more on the technical side. And then we
19 have the public advisor, that's me, I deal more on
20 the people side. In either case, we don't advocate
21 for one party or position, we don't give legal
22 advice, and so on.

23 Just briefly, here's a list of the
24 factors that are laid out in statutes and rules
25 about how the Commission decides the factors they

1 need to consider when granting or considering the
2 granting of the certificate of need. There's also a
3 list that matches up for the route permit. One
4 thing I do want to point out about this list is the
5 list is not prioritized in any way. The rules don't
6 tell the Commission which of these on the list is
7 most important in determining the location for a
8 route.

9 And so here's a diagram that shows a
10 little bit about kind of a high level of what the
11 process looks like. You can see we're right here at
12 public information meetings. Commerce is going to
13 talk a little bit more about the environmental
14 analysis that will happen. Then we'll move into
15 public hearings and evidentiary hearings. As I
16 mentioned before, the administrative law judge will
17 write a report, and then we'll get to a decision
18 point. And then there's a similar process that will
19 follow for the route permit. And you can see along
20 the way there are numerous points where folks can
21 attend meetings and can submit written or oral
22 comments.

23 So this is sort of the same information
24 presented in a list form, if you're more of a list
25 person, and also added some estimated timelines.

1 And the key word here is estimated. So at this
2 point our best guess is there would be a decision on
3 the certificate of need in June 2016. And then the
4 same for the estimated route permit timeline, our
5 best guess today is August 2016. And, again,
6 estimated is the key word for these two slides.

7 As I mentioned, there are numerous
8 opportunities for folks to get involved, weigh in,
9 offer comments, either verbally or in writing
10 throughout the process. And one way that we'll let
11 you know about that is by sending a notice.
12 Publishing it on our website, mailing to you if
13 you're on our mailing list and so on.

14 And I'd just like to point out a few key
15 elements if you receive one of these notices, what
16 to look for. The first is the docket number.
17 That's sort of the key to finding anything at the
18 Public Utilities Commission. We file everything
19 that happens with a particular case by its docket
20 number.

21 We also have a comment period. So it's
22 not just open-ended, send us what you think whenever
23 you like to, we have a definite time period where
24 we're collecting comments on various issues. And
25 then we're going to list what are the topics that

1 we're going to comments on at this stage of the
2 game.

3 And so based on that, the key to sending
4 comments, number one, you want to include that
5 docket number. Then it ends up in the right pile,
6 right. You want to stick to the topics listed.
7 That's what's going to be most helpful, you're going
8 to get the most bang for the buck by following the
9 questions that are listed on the notice.

10 You don't need to submit your comments
11 more than once. Once they're in the record, they're
12 in the record. Verbal and written comments carry
13 the same weight so you don't need to speak them and
14 also hand them in in writing. You can do that, but
15 it's not extra credit for doing both. The
16 Commission's decision is based on the facts in the
17 record, not how many people liked one proposal
18 versus another, it's based on the facts.

19 Comments are public information so once
20 we collect them we add them to what we call our
21 eDocket system and that's out there on the Internet.
22 So all folks will have an opportunity to review
23 those if they so choose. And, again, the comments
24 need to be received before the deadline in order to
25 be counted and considered.

1 If you would like to get more information
2 about the project through the Commission's process,
3 you can see all documents that have been filed in
4 these dockets through our website. And these are
5 the steps that you would follow to do that.

6 We also have a project mailing list where
7 you can receive information about opportunities to
8 participate and sort of the project milestones or
9 highlights, if you will, throughout the process.
10 You can choose to receive that information by e-mail
11 or U.S. mail, and if you're interested in that
12 there's an orange card at the table where you came
13 in that you can fill out and just return to that
14 table before you go tonight.

15 We also have an e-mail subscription
16 service. So if you're saying, hmm, I want a little
17 bit more than just those milestones, I want to see
18 everything that happens, you can subscribe to
19 receive an e-mail notification every time something
20 new comes in. Now, for some folks it's a little too
21 much e-mail. But if you say, hmm, I'm a person that
22 I don't want to miss a thing, I want to make sure I
23 have an opportunity to read whatever happens in this
24 case this is for you. And, again, it could be a lot
25 of e-mail.

1 This is what it looks like when you get
2 to the screen to subscribe. A lot of times people
3 say it's not super user-friendly so I like to give
4 you a picture, when you get to this part, this is
5 what it should look like when you fill in the
6 information.

7 And, again, the energy facilities planner
8 for this case is Scott Ek. And then my name is
9 there as well, I'm Tracy, I'm the public advisor.
10 Either one of us would be happy to answer any
11 questions that you might have as we work through the
12 process.

13 And, with that, I will turn it over to
14 Enbridge.

15 MR. MITCH REPKA: Good evening.

16 I'd like to start off by thanking the
17 Minnesota Public Utilities Commission as well as the
18 Department of Commerce for inviting Enbridge here
19 today to share additional details with you regarding
20 the project as well as to listen to any questions or
21 comments you may have regarding the project.

22 I'd like to start today with a safety
23 moment, as is Enbridge tradition. So for those of
24 you who don't know, today is August 11th, which is
25 National 811 Day. So the purpose of the National

1 811 Day is to raise awareness of third-party damage
2 to underground utilities and facilities. So I
3 encourage you to call ahead, call 811, allow
4 adequate time for those to be located and to be
5 validated and then dig safely in and around the
6 buried facilities. So that's the safety moment for
7 today.

8 As for the presentation, we'll talk about
9 who Enbridge is, give a little history of Line 3,
10 and then give some project-specific details
11 regarding the replacement project, and then we'll
12 finish up today with project benefits.

13 So who is Enbridge? Enbridge owns and
14 operates the world's longest crude oil pipeline
15 system. It delivers approximately 2.2 million
16 barrels of crude oil a day and meets the needs of
17 approximately 70 percent of the demand of the local
18 refineries here in the Great Lakes area.

19 As you can see on the map, Enbridge has a
20 variety of assets across North America. The yellow
21 lines indicate the liquid petroleum system I
22 referenced earlier. And if you can see the blue or
23 green lines on the map, those are natural gas assets
24 that the company also has. As well as, in addition
25 to those assets, the company also has renewable

1 energy assets consisting of wind, solar, and
2 geothermal.

3 The company operates under three core
4 values: Integrity, safety, and respect. And these
5 three values are interwoven in everything we do as a
6 company, whether it be in the design, construction,
7 planning, or long-term operation and maintenance of
8 our facilities.

9 Safety is important to the local
10 landowners, to community members, and to those other
11 stakeholders along the route who are interested in
12 the project. Enbridge takes this seriously and is
13 committed to the long-term safety of the entire
14 Enbridge system as well as those facilities here in
15 Minnesota.

16 As for the history of Line 3, it was
17 originally constructed in the 1960s and was placed
18 into service in 1968. The existing Line 3 is a
19 34-inch diameter pipeline that runs from Edmonton,
20 Alberta to Superior, Wisconsin and is roughly 1,100
21 miles in length. It is an integral part of the
22 Enbridge mainline system and delivers crude to
23 refineries here in Minnesota, Wisconsin, as well as
24 other locations across North America.

25 And what we're here today to discuss is

1 the Line 3 replacement program. The project is an
2 integrity- and maintenance-driven project, and
3 therefore we're proposing to replace the existing
4 34-inch Line 3 with a new pipeline that runs from
5 Edmonton, Alberta to Superior, Wisconsin. The new
6 line is approximately 1,031 miles in length and 36
7 inches in diameter. Regulatory approvals are
8 currently being sought in both Canada and the U.S.
9 and we expect construction to start in 2016.

10 The overall cost of the replacement
11 program is \$7.5 billion, which makes it one of North
12 America's largest infrastructure projects. Of that
13 total, 2.6 billion relates to the U.S. portion of
14 the project.

15 As for the U.S. portion, as I mentioned
16 earlier, it is a maintenance- and integrity-driven
17 project, therefore resulting in the permanent
18 deactivation of the existing Line 3 once the new
19 facility is up and operational. This will reduce
20 the need for future maintenance and integrity
21 related activities along the existing corridor.

22 The project in the U.S. is 364 miles in
23 length, it consists of 13 miles in North Dakota, 337
24 miles here in Minnesota, and 14 miles in Wisconsin.

25 We have filed the certificate of need and

1 pipeline routing permit in April of 2015 and, as
2 mentioned earlier, we expect construction to start
3 pending regulatory approvals in 2016 to the 2017
4 construction year.

5 Here's an overview of the project within
6 Minnesota. The preferred route is the purple line
7 shown here and it follows the proposed Sandpiper
8 corridor into Superior, Wisconsin. The project must
9 enter Minnesota in Kittson County here to allow it
10 to be tied into the Line 3 system in North Dakota
11 and must travel through Clearbrook to allow for
12 deliveries to the Minnesota Pipe Line system, as
13 well as our existing terminal there. And the
14 project must also exit in Carlton County to allow it
15 to tie into our Wisconsin system.

16 The project is designed to flow 760,000
17 barrels per day. It also has eight pump stations
18 located along the line as shown in the orange boxes
19 here. There are four stations north and west of
20 Clearbrook and four pump stations south and east of
21 Clearbrook.

22 There are 27 main line valves
23 strategically placed along the corridor. As far as
24 land acquisition, the construction footprint is 120
25 feet in width in uplands and 95 feet in wetlands.

1 The permanent easement is 50 feet in width. In
2 locations where we're adjacent to existing members'
3 facilities, the project will require 25 feet of
4 additional easement and therefore sharing the 25
5 feet with the adjacent facility.

6 So the route is 98 percent located along
7 existing utility corridors north and west of
8 Clearbrook and 75 percent located along existing
9 utility corridors south and east of Clearbrook. The
10 estimated cost of the project in Minnesota is \$2.1
11 billion.

12 The project will bring several benefits.
13 As mentioned earlier, due to the fact of the
14 existing line being permanently deactivated there
15 will be a reduction of the need for long-term
16 maintenance and integrity dig activities along the
17 existing corridor. The project will also restore
18 the historic operating capabilities of Line 3 so
19 therefore apportionment in the system will be
20 reduced as a result of the project.

21 As for jobs, we anticipate 1,500
22 construction jobs will be created as a result of the
23 project, and 50 percent of those jobs will come from
24 local union halls here in Minnesota. During
25 construction those jobs that will be created will

1 require -- those individuals will require housing,
2 food, services from local businesses, and so we
3 expect the local businesses will see a significant
4 increase in business as well.

5 On a long-term basis, there will be
6 additional positions added to the Enbridge workforce
7 in order to operate and maintain the new line, as
8 well as there will be incremental increase in tax
9 revenue.

10 UNIDENTIFIED: Could you hold the mic a
11 little closer? There is some in the back here that
12 can't hear you very well.

13 MR. MITCH REPKA: Sure.

14 UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you.

15 MR. MITCH REPKA: In regards to the
16 benefits, the long-term benefits that I was
17 mentioning, the tax revenues will be increased as a
18 result of the project and we anticipate that taxes
19 will increase by about \$19.5 million throughout the
20 state and that will go to the local counties that
21 the new line will operate in. You know, that's
22 funding that has been used for infrastructure
23 improvements, potentially reduction in taxes for the
24 local members of the county. So those are the
25 long-term benefits of the project.

1 Again, I'd like to thank the PUC as well
2 as the DOC for allowing us to speak today.

3 With me here today, we've get several
4 Enbridge personnel as well, in order to address
5 questions and listen to any comments you may have.
6 So I'd like to just take a second for them to
7 introduce themselves. So if you could?

8 Sorry, I'll start with the introductions.
9 Mitch Repka, I'm the manager of engineering and
10 construction for the U.S. portion of Line 3.

11 MR. JOHN MCKAY: Good evening.

12 I'm John McKay, I'm the senior manager
13 for land services for all the U.S. projects. And I
14 provide oversight of planning, acquisition of land
15 rights, construction, acquisitional activities, for
16 these pipeline projects.

17 MR. JOHN GLANZER: Hello.

18 I'm John Glanzer, the director of
19 infrastructure planning for Enbridge, where we take
20 a forward look for planning purposes on the entire
21 Enbridge liquids pipelines network.

22 MR. BARRY SIMONSON: Good evening,
23 everyone.

24 My name is Barry Simonson, I am the
25 project director for Line 3. With that, I guess I

1 have the full accountability from the inception to
2 the completion of the Line 3 replacement for
3 Enbridge. Thank you.

4 MR. ARSHIA JAVAHERIAN: Good evening.

5 My name is Arshia Javaherian, I'm a
6 senior legal counsel with Enbridge, I'm the in-house
7 attorney responsible for the regulatory permitting
8 and land acquisition.

9 MR. PAUL TURNER: Hello and good evening.

10 My name is Paul Turner, I'm the
11 supervisor of our environmental permitting team
12 supporting the Line 3 Replacement Project.

13 MR. JOHN PECHIN: Good evening.

14 My name is John Pechin, I'm the Bemidji
15 area operations manager, and my responsibility is
16 electrical and technical maintenance after the
17 project is in service.

18 MR. MITCH REPKA: Thanks.

19 And I'll turn it over to the DOC.

20 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Good evening,
21 everyone.

22 I'm Jamie MacAlister with the Energy
23 Environmental Review and Analysis unit. And with me
24 is Larry Hartman, many of you probably know Larry
25 and have worked with Larry on other projects.

1 Just a couple of housekeeping items here
2 as we get started. You hopefully grabbed a folder
3 of information when you came in the door. In that
4 packet you should have a scoping document, a draft
5 scoping document for the comparative environmental
6 analysis. Some maps. A speaker card if you choose
7 to speak. If you prefer to not speak, you're
8 welcome to write your question on a card and bring
9 that up and we will answer your question. A comment
10 form, as well as guidance on how to submit comments
11 to us.

12 So this evening what I would like to do
13 is give you a brief overview of our permitting
14 process, talk to you a little bit about the scope
15 and the environmental analysis, cover some examples
16 of route segment alternatives, as well as a quick
17 overview of the schedule and quickly get into our
18 question-and-answer session.

19 So the pipeline routing process is
20 governed by Minnesota Statute 216G and Minnesota
21 Rule 7852. This pipeline project will be a full
22 review process which will include the completion of
23 an environmental document which is called a
24 comparative environmental analysis. And it will
25 also include public hearings to be presided over by

1 an administrative law judge.

2 And similar to Tracy's overview, process
3 overview, a couple of things to note here. That in
4 addition to these public scoping and information
5 meetings, we will then collect the route and segment
6 alternatives proposed, that will be packaged up and
7 sent to the Commission and they will ultimately make
8 the decision on which route alternatives and
9 segments get carried forward for the environmental
10 analysis.

11 So these scoping meetings are really
12 important because they give the public and
13 government agencies, tribes, an opportunity to
14 identify the impacts and issues that are important
15 to them on the project. These can be human and
16 environmental. It allows people to participate in
17 the development of the route and segment
18 alternatives. And as I mentioned before, these
19 route alternatives are ultimately approved by the
20 PUC.

21 So many of you might be wondering what a
22 comparative environmental analysis is. And as I
23 mentioned previously, it is the environmental
24 document for pipelines. It is an alternative form
25 of environmental review that has been approved by

1 the Minnesota EQB to meet the Minnesota
2 Environmental Policy Act requirements. The EQB is
3 the Environmental Quality Board. And the objective
4 analysis, the document is meant to provide an
5 objective analysis of the project. So we're looking
6 at impacts and mitigation measures. We're not
7 advocating for any routes on these projects, we are
8 really providing the facts for the public and
9 decision-makers to make informed decisions.

10 So in providing your comments and
11 suggesting route alternatives, what's very helpful
12 is a map. But it can be an aerial photo, it can be
13 a topo map, it can be your plat book map identifying
14 your route or route segment. And it's helpful if
15 you include a brief description of the existing
16 environment and as much supporting information as
17 you can. That will reduce the amount of time that
18 we have to spend trying to decipher what you really
19 meant when you were suggesting your route
20 alternative or segment alternative.

21 And as was mentioned earlier, that any of
22 the alternatives that are suggested really need to
23 mitigate specific impacts. These can be aesthetic
24 impacts, land use impacts, agricultural impacts,
25 impacts to natural resources, or other impacts that

1 you feel are important in your project area.

2 They also need to meet the needs of the
3 project. So that being said, we know that it has to
4 come in at Kittson County, the project needs to make
5 it to Clearbrook, and it needs to get to Superior.
6 So those would be the three places that you would be
7 looking for in looking at your route alternatives if
8 you suggest any.

9 I'm just going to quickly run through
10 some examples from a transmission line of how route
11 alternatives have been used to deal with specific
12 issues. This first example is suggestions for how
13 to avoid a historic property. The second example is
14 realigning the proposed route closer to an existing
15 roadway. The third one is moving the project away
16 from a memorial site.

17 And then, finally, what I really wanted
18 to talk about were the maps that you should have in
19 your packet, they're also in the scoping document.
20 This first map is an overview of the alternatives
21 that have been suggested and approved by the PUC for
22 the Sandpiper Pipeline route. As you know, this
23 route will be collocated east of Clearbrook. And a
24 closeup of that should be on the back side of your
25 map.

1 And this shows you that there are
2 currently 31 alternatives on the table for inclusion
3 in the comparative environmental analysis. So all
4 of these routes that have already been approved by
5 the Commission will also be considered for Line 3.
6 We are also currently, as far as this process,
7 taking any additional route alternatives or segment
8 alternatives that you might have for the Line 3
9 portion of this project. And it's probably worth
10 noting that there is a large alternative that goes
11 south of Clearbrook and then comes back up to
12 Superior.

13 Quickly, the route permitting schedule.
14 We have worked very hard to try and bring the
15 Sandpiper and Line 3 schedules together at this
16 point so that both projects can be looked at in a
17 comparative environmental analysis as a combined
18 project, as well as looking at them individually.
19 So right now the routes that we discussed that were
20 accepted by the Commission, that happened last
21 summer in August. We're anticipating that any new
22 route alternatives will be approved sometime in
23 November. We anticipate the environmental -- the
24 CEA would be released sometime in March of next
25 year, and with public hearings and contested case

1 hearings following that, and a permit decision in
2 July or August of next year.

3 So just a few courtesy items as we move
4 into the question-and-answer session. We're looking
5 for one speaker at a time. Please state and spell
6 your name for Janet. If you don't do that, she will
7 kindly remind you. Try to limit your comments to a
8 few minutes so that we can accommodate everyone who
9 is here to speak. Let's maintain respect for others
10 and try to direct your comments to the scope of the
11 comparative environmental analysis.

12 So your comments tonight, as Tracy has
13 already noted, will be in the record. You can also
14 complete and submit a comment form. You can either
15 put that in the comment form box back on the table.
16 You can comment online. You can mail or fax, e-mail
17 the comments to me directly. And, again, make sure
18 that your comments are in by September 30th, 2015.

19 All right. With that, we'll move into
20 our question-and-answer portion.

21 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The first speaker
22 card I have is Robert Teran, T-E-R-A-N.

23 MR. ROBERT TERAN: Robert Teran,
24 T-E-R-A-N. I represent the International Union of
25 Operating Engineers, the Pipeline Department.

1 I'm here to say that the operating
2 engineers are in support of Line 3 Replacement
3 Project. We feel by replacing Line 3 it would be in
4 the safety and interest of citizens, livestock,
5 wildlife and the protection of farmland and the
6 natural environment from potential accidents from
7 the use of all different structures.

8 Also, the construction of this project
9 would be putting to work local, seasoned, qualified
10 heavy equipment operators from local union halls
11 that will be putting money back into the local
12 economy.

13 Also, with the projects being completed,
14 it would boost a finished product that would help
15 alleviate our demand from foreign countries and
16 would be sending less U.S. dollars overseas that
17 might be funding potential or future enemies of the
18 United States.

19 Thank you.

20 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Thank you.

21 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Tom Pahkala. Did I
22 butcher that?

23 MR. TOM PAHKALA: That's okay.

24 Good evening. My name is Tom Pahkala,
25 P-A-H-K-A-L-A.

1 I am a current member of UA Plumbers
2 Local 15 out of Minneapolis, Minnesota. And I just
3 wanted to express my support for the Line 3
4 replacement, because as a service industry, a piping
5 service industry employee for the last 20-odd years,
6 I've run into a lot of old, aging infrastructure in
7 pipes that just cause a lot of troubles in the
8 future. All they do is cause troubles. The longer
9 they age, they cause more and more troubles.

10 Also, I'd like to say that the new
11 pipeline is obviously going to be running at the
12 optimal pressure for it and we can't run the old
13 pipeline at that pressure simply because of the
14 aging infrastructure problems.

15 And the environmental safety of it is
16 tremendous because of the aging pipeline. The aging
17 infrastructure is a serious risk to the environment
18 and it's better to get the thing replaced with new
19 pipe so that we can have a safer environment. And
20 the economic growth is also great.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Scott Erlander.

23 MR. SCOTT ERLANDER: Hello. My name is
24 Scott Erlander, two Ts, E-R-L-A-N-D-E-R.

25 Like Tom, I'm also a member of United

1 Association, which is the governing body of
2 pipefitters, plumbers and sprinkler fitters in the
3 UA here in the United States and Canada. I'm a
4 36-year member and, like a lot of other people here,
5 I've been around construction most of my life.

6 And I think that there's a lot of
7 different impact studies, that have been done on
8 this. There's a lot of things to consider, but I
9 think the main thing is that this -- Enbridge is
10 going to do this line safe, it's going to be put in
11 with a lot more stringent guidelines, on economic
12 impact. And assuming this pipeline will take
13 several years before it's finally approved and then
14 several more years to actually install it before
15 it's commissioned, it's going to be over 52 years
16 old.

17 And environmentally speaking, you know,
18 I'm a hunter and a fisherman and I appreciate the
19 environment as much as anyone and I don't want to
20 see oil spilled. And replacing this pipeline just
21 makes economic sense and this new pipeline will last
22 for probably 100 years, longer than the other one.

23 Thanks for your time.

24 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Thank you.

25 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker card

1 I have is David Barnett.

2 MR. DAVID BARNETT: Good evening.

3 I'm David Barnett, B-A-R-N-E-T-T. And I
4 want to thank you for allowing us to comment.

5 This project is very important to us. I
6 represent the pipeline workers throughout the United
7 States for United Association. I go all over the
8 United States and travel the United States pushing
9 for projects exactly like this one. And the hardest
10 thing I have and the challenge to get projects to
11 this point is to get the client to spend the money
12 to replace, completely replace a pipeline. And this
13 client, Enbridge, has dedicated \$2.6 billion to do a
14 full replacement of this project. And I think
15 that's speaks a lot for what they feel for the
16 environment and for safety of their pipelines, as
17 the gentleman spoke about before.

18 I just want to be on record to say that
19 we strongly support this project. We feel this is
20 exactly the way to handle our aging infrastructure.
21 Out of the 1,500 jobs, our members would have
22 thousands of man-hours from this and if it is not
23 approved that's thousands of man-hours that they
24 will not get and so it's very important to me and my
25 membership.

1 The environment would be a winner from
2 this replacement as well. There's nothing more
3 important than our environment to us. We're all
4 hunters and fishers and we care for the environment
5 and we think the right thing to do is to transport
6 oil through the most technological way that we can
7 in this day and time, and that would be total
8 replacement of this pipeline.

9 The UA across the United States, we spend
10 \$250 million a year in training, and much of that
11 training is spent on pipeline workers, our welders,
12 our pipefitters, and our helpers that do this kind
13 of work.

14 So I just want to thank you again for
15 letting me be here and we strongly support this
16 project.

17 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The last speaker card
18 we have so far is from Patrick Johnson.

19 MR. PATRICK JOHNSON: Good evening.

20 My name is Patrick Johnson,
21 J-O-H-N-S-O-N. I am the director of major projects
22 at Westwood Professional Services. I have served as
23 the project director for land survey operations on
24 similar major pipeline construction projects for
25 Enbridge. Finally, and most importantly, I am a

1 Minnesota resident with the best interests of my
2 home state at heart.

3 I wish to state my strong support for a
4 timely, comprehensive review and approval of the
5 Line 3 pipeline application before the MN PUC today.
6 Westwood Professional Services is a Minnesota born
7 company headquartered in Eden Prairie and operates
8 throughout the U.S. We were established in 1972,
9 Westwood is a strong, reputable company which has
10 enhanced Minnesota's communities and infrastructure
11 with lasting, effective design and engineering
12 solutions, and over the years provided many secure
13 jobs and supporting Minnesota's tax base.

14 Westwood employs professional land
15 surveyors, engineers, environmental scientists,
16 mappers, and geographic information specialists to
17 assist with the development and construction of oil
18 and gas facilities.

19 In addition to oil and gas, we support
20 land development, wind, solar, power delivery
21 projects. Many of this staff has been and is
22 expected to provide expert services on the Line 3
23 project.

24 Westwood currently employs more than 400
25 full-time employees nationwide. Approximately 130

1 of those employees are residents of Minnesota, many
2 of which are steady oil and gas industry staff. Due
3 to the nature of the business, it is necessary for
4 us to employ additional staff in order to
5 effectively support our pipeline clients and
6 projects. Although the number of staff varies per
7 project, on a project of the magnitude of the Line 3
8 project we expect to employ approximately 150 to 200
9 people on a single job. Of that 150 to 200 people,
10 50 to 75 will be Minnesota residents. And coupled
11 with the corporate taxes, this project will generate
12 from Westwood, which is approximately 1 percent or
13 less of the total project value, around 3 and a half
14 million dollars in revenues for the state.

15 In addition, the amount of money
16 introduced to local communities through the purchase
17 of goods, services and housing and subsistence by
18 the employees of Westwood alone amounts to
19 approximately 5 to 6 million dollars through the
20 life of just the construction portion of the
21 process.

22 As a long-time partner with Enbridge on
23 providing services on similar pipeline projects,
24 Westwood has had the opportunity to observe
25 Enbridge's commitment to safety and environmental

1 impacts while constructing and operating large oil
2 transportation pipelines. In my opinion, based on
3 observations over a 20-plus-year career in pipeline
4 planning, design, and construction, Enbridge
5 maintains the highest standards in the industry and
6 the state of Minnesota could not have a better
7 operator developing this type of facility within its
8 borders.

9 Westwood urges you to move forward with
10 the approval process and help us put our people on
11 the job.

12 Thank you very much for your time.

13 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Thank you.

14 That appears to be the end of the speaker
15 cards that we have. Are there any other questions
16 or comments out there?

17 Well, with that, I think we will close
18 this meeting. I would like to let everyone know
19 that we will be here after the meeting to answer
20 questions for you, and Enbridge staff is also
21 available to answer questions.

22 Thank you again for joining us this
23 evening.

24 (Proceedings concluded at 6:48 p.m.)
25